INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT RESEARCH
P-ISSN: 1118-4256, E-ISSN:3034-4327
Vol. 5| No.1 | June 2024
Page No.: 279-302

WORKPLACE INCIVILITY AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE OF BREWING FIRMS IN ANAMBRA STATE

Amaka Favour Ojimba[1]

Prof. Ezimma Nnabuife[2]

[1&2]Department of Business Administration, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.

Abstract
It has been noticed that some Nigerians now rely on imported alcoholic drinks because some alcoholic drinks produced in Nigeria are of low quality which could be the lack of commitment on the part of the employees due to the way in which their supervisors behave badly to them. The broad objective of this study is to examine the relationship between workplace incivility and employee performance of brewing firms in Anambra State. The study was fastened on the Affective Event Theory (AET) propounded by Weiss and Cropanzano (1996) at the university of Colorado. Survey research design was used for the study, questionnaire was the data collection instrument employed by the researcher. A sample size of 288 was derived using Taro Yamanne sampling formula. Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to test the hypothesis. Findings obtained from a test of the formulated hypothesis revealed that there is a negative relationship between supervisor incivility and employee commitment in brewing firms in Anambra State with the Correlation Coefficient of -0.966 and P-value of 0.000 < .05. Base on that, the researcher concluded that workplace incivility has a negative relationship with employee performance of brewing firms in Anambra State. As a follow up to the findings obtained from a test of the formulated hypothesis, the researcher recommended that supervisors of the studied brewing firms should avoid all forms of uncivil behaviours as it could impact the commitment level of employees.

Key Words: Workplace Incivility, Employee Performance, Supervisor Incivility and Employee Commitment.

Introduction

In an extremely competitive market today, it has become increasing important for organizations to make employees to share information actively and give some suggestions for company development **(**Shi, Gao & Huang., 2012**).** These behaviours have been studied from different perspectives: both as outcome variable and predictor variable (Bruursema, 2004; Mount, Ilies, & Johnson, 2006). Initially, research regarding workplace deviance has been limited to different types of mistreatment such as harassment, bullying, aggression, and injustice (Chen & Spector, 2012). However, recently incivility has gained the attention of management researchers (Lim & Cortina, 2005; Penney & Spector, 2005).

According to (Griffin, 2010) workplace incivility has linkage with intention to quit when employees ignore this kind of behave then who are behave uncivil our quietness give then more strengthen. (Lim, Cortina, & Magley, 2008; Lim & Lee, 2011) link it with employees satisfaction. Workplace incivility is measured by supervisor incivility, co-workers incivility and customer incivility. This study will focus on supervisor's incivility.

Supervisor's incivility is very sensitive issue in an organization because of the supposed employee-supervisor relationship. Supervisor incivility has been defined as supervisor's low intensity deviant behaviour with ambiguous intent to harm the subordinate, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect (Anderson & Pearson, 1999). Supervisors elicit employees' emotions and behaviours thinking that they are helpless and bound to do whatever they order, undermining their performance and devotion to work (Mark and William, 2018).

According to Alexendra (2013), employee performance is the ability of an employee to attain a specified goal effectively and efficiently. It is the actual output of employees as

measured against established organizational ideal (Richard, Devinney, Yip, & Johnson, 2009). Several studies have been done over the years to seek the best ways to impact employee performance as a result of its effect on the overall performance level of the organization (Magaji, Akpa & Akinlabi 2017). Employee performance is measured by employee commitment, employee turnover, efficiency, effectiveness, etc. This study will focus on employee commitment.

Employee commitment is a state where employees cling to an organization and its values (Manning & Curtis, 2009). A committed employee is more compatible with the organization and more productive than those employees with lower levels of satisfaction, loyalty, and responsibility. Employees who perceived incivility behaviour at work may indicate frustration, anger, stress or aggression behavior (Speedy, 2006; Reio & Ghosh 2009; Sidle, 2009). This gives a great confidence to the determination of the relationship between workplace incivility and employee performance of brewing firms in Anambra State. The Brewing firms selected for this study are: International Breweries and Life Breweries.

Statement of Problem

The brewery sub sector is responsible for the provision of beer to the growing population of Nigeria. However, it has been noticed that some Nigerians now rely on imported alcoholic drinks because some alcoholic drinks produced in Nigeria are of low quality which could be the lack of commitment on the part of the employees due to the way in which their supervisors behave badly to them. It is recognized as a growing problem (Andersson & Pearson, 2009; Pearson, Andersson, & Porath, 2010) as employees attempt to do more with less. Those treated badly, try to avoid their supervisor and their colleagues. This is in line with the study of (Saleem, Muhammad, Iqra and Qasim, 2022) on Workplace Incivility and Employee Performance: A Dual Theory Perspective on a single sector in Switzerland and the study of (Mehmood, Muhammad, Yasmeen, 2021) on Workplace

Incivility and Organizational Commitment: The Case of Public Sector Women Colleges in Punjab, Pakistan. These supervisors lose their temper, bully others, behave arrogantly, and ignore the strengths of others. As a result, they lose energy and develop intentions to leave their job. The foregoing gives credence to this study.

Objective of the Study

The broad objective of this study is to examine the relationship between workplace incivility and employee performance of brewing firms in Anambra State.

Specifically, this study seeks to ascertain the extent of relationship between supervisor incivility and employee commitment.

Research Question

What is the relationship between supervisor incivility and employee commitment?

Statement of Hypothesis

Ha: There is a significant positive relationship between supervisor incivility and employee commitment.

Significance of the Study

This will be an immense benefit to Brewing firms, especially Life breweries and International breweries in Anambra State. It will help them to understand the effects workplace incivility could have on the performance of employees in an organization. It will also help student and future researchers to contribute to the existing body of knowledge for those who intend to carry out a related study. Lastly, it will also help different sectors of the economy both in Nigeria and other climes as it would broadens their minds on the effect of workplace incivility could have on employee performance.

Scope of the Study

This study is centered on workplace incivility and employee performance of Life Breweries and International Breweries in Anambra State. The locations of the used brewing firms, Life breweries is at Port Harcourt Road in Onitsha and International breweries is at Niger Bridge Head in Onitsha.

Limitation of Study

The only limitation encountered by the researcher was respondent apathy. However, the researcher was able to overcome this challenge by convincing the respondents to complete copies of the questionnaire given them.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Conceptual Review

Workplace Incivility

Workplace incivility is described as low intensity deviant behaviour with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms of mutual respect (Anderson & Pearson, 2009).

Incivility can be seen as a milder form of deviant behavior in which the intention to harm is less apparent (Lim, Cortina & Magley, 2008). Workplace incivility is defined as a form of organizational deviance, on an interpersonal level (Robinson & Bennett, 2005).

Uncivil behaviours are characteristically rude and discourteous, displaying a lack of regard for others" (Andersson & Pearson, 2009). Within this framework, it is likely to say that the definition shows violation of mutual respect and work rules, counter productive work behaviour, rude or discourteous behavior from other employees (Porath & Erez, 2007). If employees' expectations regarding their work and work-related factors are met, they will show positive attitude towards their work (Cingöz & Kaplan, 2015). . The components of

workplace incivility includes; supervisor's incivility, co-workers incivility and customer incivility.

Employee Performance

Employee performance is the result of work in quality and quantity achieved by an employee in carrying out his duties in accordance with the responsibilities given to him (Robbins, 2010). There is no general overarching theory about employee performance . As a result of this, people management has a significant impact on performance (Wainwright, 2018). According to Alexendra, 2013), employee performance is the ability of an employee to attain a specified goal effectively and efficiently. It is the actual output of employees as measured against established organizational ideal (Richard, Devinney, Yip, & Johnson, 2009). Employee performance has so many measures. Some of them are employee commitment, employee engagement, job satisfaction, and employee turnover intention and employee innovation.

Hypothesis Variables

Supervisor Incivility

Supervisor's incivility is characterized by uncivil behaviour of supervisor to an employee; this harmful act includes avoiding the employee, gossiping, and uttering negative comments (Reio and Sanders, 2011), this is detrimental to employees and organization. Supervisor's incivility is more harmful than other forms of incivility (customer incivility and co-worker incivility) because of the organizational authority vested on the supervisor to manage several concerns including behavioural issues. In the extant literature of Bunk and Magley (2013), pointed out that incivility leads the target to reciprocate in an uncivil way Also, Sliter ,*Slister & Jex* (2012) and Taylor & *Kluemper*, (2012) noted that incivility makes employees less creative and eventually decreases citizenship behaviour that triggers anger and distrust in the organization (Bunk and Magley, 2013).

Employee Commitment

Employee commitment is an emotional attachment to and involvement with an organization (Sayed, 2022). Dictionary of Human Resources Management and Personnel Management describes employee commitment as the employees 'feeling of loyalty' to the organization where they work (Dena, Michael, and Quinn 2003). They see the organization as their own. They tend to have a sense of fraternization in an institution (Robbin & Coulter, 2013; Galford & Seibold, 2006). Employees who are committed are motive driven and are employees whose personal aim aligns with that of the organization. Kaneshiron (2008) contends that employees' commitment could directly impact organizational performance and the competitive standpoint of an organization condition of reciprocity is that the two parties can achieve their goals by exchanging their unique resources (Lawler & Thye, 1999).

Theoretical Framework

This study is fastened on the Affective Event Theory (AET) propounded by Weiss and Cropanzano(1996) at the university of Colorado. This theory postulates that if employees are not satisfy with organizational unfair practices, employees' emotions are affected and this is likely to influence their jobs which are often reactionary in nature. This emotional response intensity consequently affects job satisfaction and performance (Wegge, Van-Dick, Fisher, West & Dawson, 2006).

This theory is relevant to this study because when employees of the focused firms perceive that they are unfairly treated by their superiors, it could lead to exhibition of negative behaviours by these employees. This by extension could impact the performance level of these employees.

Empirical Review

Irsan, Hendryadi,, Saida & Sukisno (2020) examined workplace incivility, work engagement, and turnover intentions in Indonesea. In total, 644 employees from various business industries in Indonesia completed a quantitative survey relating to their perceptions of workplace incivility, work engagement, and turnover intention. Data were analyzed with partial least square multi-group analysis technique (PLS-MGA).The results show that workplace incivility has a negative effect on work engagement, and a positive effect on turnover intention, and the intensity of these relationships differ by gender.

Jeannie (2009) explored the relationships among workplace incivility, conflict management styles and their influence on perceived job performance, organizational commitment and turnover intentions. Total population was 289. Differences between incivility target and instigator perspectives were also examined. Data were collected through a self- report survey questionnaire consisting of a battery of six scales. Research questions were tested through correlational and hierarchical regression analytic procedures. Findings revealed that incivility and conflict management styles influenced perceived job performance, organizational commitment and turnover intentions to varying degrees.

Muhammad, Arifa, & Muhammad (2017) investigated the impact of workplace incivility on employee absenteeism and organizational commitment. Data analyses was done through Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21.The respondents of this research are nurses located in hospitals in Faisalabad. The sample size is two hundred out of which 184 is considered. The hypothesis generated for the study was tested at 0.05.Data is analyzed through descriptive and inferential tests on the responses gathered. The results of this study showed that there is a significant relationship between workplace incivility and Employee absenteeism.

Saleem, Muhammad, Iqra and Qasim,(2022) examined workplace incivility and employee performance: a dual theory perspective on a single sector in Switzerland. The conservation of resources (COR) theory and Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory provided the grounds for developing the framework. The data were collected through closed-ended

questionnaires and were analyzed using structural equation modeling with SmartPLS. The results affirmed that incivility is harmful to the performance of employees, and that trust in supervisors helps employees to perform well. The trust in the supervisor significantly mediates the incivility–performance relationship.

Cingöz and Kaplan (2015) investigated the effect of workplace incivility on job satisfaction and organizational trust. Data were collected from administrative staff of industrial enterprises operating in kayseri, turkey, 123 administrative staff participated in the study. The findings of the research showed that there was a statistically non-significant and negative relationship between workplace incivility and job satisfaction.

Nwaeke and Akani (2019) examined the effects of down top workplace incivility on organizational health of deposit money banks in Rivers State. This study explored quasi-experimental research design. The population of the study comprises of 17 deposit money banks operating in Port Harcourt quoted in the Nigeria Stock Exchange. Three hundred and forty six respondents were obtained as sample size, using the Taro Yemen's formula. Spearman rank correlation was used to test the null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance computed within SPSS software. The study found that there is a negative and no significant relationship between down top workplace incivility and resource utilization, negative and no significant relationship between down top workplace incivility and cohesiveness.

Miebaka and Ukwuije (2021) explored workplace incivility and counterproductive work behaviour. The paper being a largely conceptual in nature adopted a desk research methodology in reviewing extant literature. Based on the findings in extant literature, it was obvious that workplace incivility and counterproductive work behaviour have a significant nexus. The study gave useful insights on the ubiquitous nature of workplace incivility and its attendant impact of work outcomes.

Mehmood, Ramzan, and Yasmeen, (2021*)* investigated workplace incivility and organizational commitment: the case of public sector women colleges in Punjab Pakistan. The study integrates with Affective Event Theory and Conservation of Resources Theory.

Through cross-sectional survey the data were collected from female faculty of public sector female colleges in Northern, central and southern Punjab, Pakistan. In this regard, results of the study showed that co-worker incivility and principle/supervisor incivility had a negative and significant effect on affective commitment, continues commitment and normative commitment of the respondents. Chang-e, Wei Xie and Jie (2018) examined the extent to which Chinese traditionality moderates the relationship between supervisor incivility and employee silence. Collecting 245 employee's data, we show that supervisor incivility is associated with employee silence. Moreover, we find that Chinese traditionality moderates the main effect negatively, such that the higher employees with Chinese traditionality, the weaker the relationship between supervisor incivility and employee silence; the lower employees with Chinese traditionality, the stronger the relationship between supervisor incivility and employee silence; Implications for theory and practice are discussed.

Alola, Asongu and Alola (2021) explored linking supervisor incivility with job embeddedness and cynicism: The mediating role of employee self-efficacy. Applying conservation of resource theory and self-efficacy theory, the study investigates the relationship between supervisors' incivility, self-efficacy, cynicism, and job embeddedness of employees in the hotel industry. A non-probability sampling technique was used to collect 245 questionnaires from frontline employees of five star and four star hotels in Nigeria. The finding reveals that supervisor incivility has a negative effect on self-efficacy and a positive effect on cynicism and that self-efficacy negatively affects cynicism.

Summary of Related Literature

The study of previous scholars shows that the concept of workplace incivility and employee commitment is not new to the Nigerian environment and other climes. The study of Irsan, Hendryadi, Saida & Sukisno (2020), Jeannie (2009), Muhammad, Arifa, & Muhammad

(2017), Saleem, Muhammad, Iqra and Qasim,(2022), Cingöz and Kaplan (2015)**,** Nwaeke and Akani (2019), Miebaka and Ukwuije (2021), Mehmood, Ramzan, and Yasmeen, (2021*)*, Chang-e, Wei Xie and Jie (2018), Alola, Asongu and Alola (2021), and Sliter and Jex (2012) reveals that there exists a number of previous empirical studies in this area. However, none of the empirically reviewed examined workplace incivility as it relates to employee performance of brewing firms in Anambra State. This is the gap in knowledge that this study seeks to fill.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

A survey research Design was adopted for the study because of the nature and characteristics of the study. A Survey Design is a research design that allows the researcher to collect data from a sampled respondents. Survey design suits this study since the study sought to ascertain the nature of relationship existing between variables for the study. The design was used to seek the opinion of respondents on impact of workplace incivility as it relates to employee performance of brewing firms in Anambra state.

Area of Study

The study is conducted in Anambra state with particular reference to Anambra north senatorial Zone which is made up of Oyi LGA, Ayamelum LGA, Ogbaru LGA, Onitsha south LGA, Onitsha north LGA, Anambra east and Anambra west LGA. The current Anambra State was created in 1991. The capital and seat of government is Awka. The theme of the state is “Light of the Nation”. The boundaries of the state are formed by Delta State to the west, Imo State and Rivers State to the south, Enugu State to the east and Kogi State to the north. (http://www.anambrastate.gov.ng/history; https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anambra_State).

Population of the Study

The population of the study will consists of all the 1,012 employees of the two existing brewery firms in Anambra State. The brewery firms with their individual population are Nigerian Brewery Limited (Life Brewery) 265 and international Brewery has 747 employees.

Sample Size Determination

The sample size of the study will be determined using Taro Yamane's Statistical formula. The formula is given below as:

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$$

Where:

n = sample size.

N = population size (1012).

e = error limit (0.05).

$$n = \frac{1012}{1+1012(0.05)^2}$$

n = 287

Sampling Technique

The researcher will make use of simple random sampling technique through the use of Table of Random numbers to distribute questionnaire. This will help in determine who gets questionnaire and who does not, to avoid bias. However, to determine what proportion of questionnaire goes to each of the studied brewery firms, Bowley's proportionate allocation formula will be utilized. The formula and calculation is shown thus:

$$nh = \frac{nNh}{N}$$

Where:

n = total sample size.

Nh = Number of items in each stratum in the population.

N = population size.

Nigeria Brewery Ltd $= \frac{265}{1012}$ x 287 = 75

International Brewery = $\frac{747}{1012}$ x 287 = 212

Sources of Data

The source of data collection employed for this study was the primary source. It was ensured by the aid of a well-structured questionnaire designed to elicit data needed for the variables of the study.

Description of Data Collection Instrument

The structured questionnaire deployed to collect data on the study is coded in line with the original Likert model of 5 points. The lowest point which is 1 will be for strongly disagree, 2 for disagree, 3 for undecided, 4, agree while the highest code 5 will stand for strongly agree.

Validity of Instrument

Face and content validity was employed in testing whether the instrument will be able to measure what it is supposed to measure. To do this, a copy of the questionnaire was give to my Supervisor who made corrections and contributions which were adopted in producing the final questionnaire used. They later certified that the instrument was valid and fit to be used for the research.

Reliability of the Instrument

Crombach Alpha reliability technique was used in testing the consistency of the instrument. This was done using 30 copies of questionnaire for a pilot study, after which they were

collected, sorted, coded and analysed. The result obtained was .832 which is higher than the benchmark of .7. The result obtained is shown in the reliability output thus:

Table 3.1: Reliability Statistic

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.832	10

Source: Field Survey, 2023

Computation: SPSS ver. 22

Method of Data Analysis

Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient will be deployed in testing the nature of relationship existing between the variables of the study. This method was chosen because the data set collected meets the assumptive requirement of Pearson Correlation technique that is a normally distributed data and the no existence of outliers in the data set. Hence Pearson's Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) technique is one of the most appropriate parametric method, and its relevance in determining nature of relationship between independent and dependent variables which would help in actualizing the objective of this study.

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This section of the study discusses the analysis of the returned and unreturned copies of the questionnaire after analyzing the data with the descriptive and inferential statistical tools suggested by the researcher.

Data Presentation and Analysis

Table 4.1 Analysis of Returned and Unreturned Questionnaire

Returned (Un-mutilated)	283	98.61%
Returned (Mutilated)	00	00.00%
Unreturned	04	01.39%
Total Copies Administered	287	100.00%

Source: Field Survey, 2023

From the table above, out of the two hundred and eighty seven (287) copies of the questionnaire administered, two hundred and eighty three (283) un-mutilated copies (98.61%) were returned, no (00) mutilated copy (00.00%) was returned while 04 (01.39%) copies were unreturned. Base on that, two hundred and eighty three (283) copies of the questionnaire were used for the analysis.

	Table 4.2: Research Question : on the relationship between supervisor incivility and employee commitment								
	Supervisor Incivility	**SA**	**S**	**UN**	**SD**	**D**	**Total**	**Mean**	**Remark**
1	Your manager avoids delegating responsibilities to some employees in your department.	120	99	22	20	22	283	4.35	Accept
2	Some supervisors in your organization gossip a-lot.	74	102	33	39	35	283	3.69	Accept
3	There are occasions where your immediate supervisor utter negative comments.	66	146	19	30	22	283	4.00	Accept
4	You have been insulted by your manager.	86	131	23	21	22	283	4.17	Accept
5	Your manager avoids giving responsibilities where extra- benefit is given to some employees in your department.	66	82	53	51	31	283	3.50	Accept
	Employee Commitment	**SA**	**S**	**UN**	**SD**	**D**	**Total**	**Mean**	**Remark**

6	You are mentally attached to your job.	61	145	24	32	21	283	3.95	Accept
7	You are emotionally attached to your organization.	50	122	39	50	22	283	3.63	Accept
8	You would like to retire in your organization.	50	153	24	37	19	283	3.88	Accept
9	You see yourself as a co-owner of your organization.	43	73	28	92	47	283	2.87	Accept
10	You have a bond with your immediate superior.	39	83	24	99	38	283	2.93	Accept

Source: Field Survey 2023

Note: A benchmark of 2.5 was used by the researcher.

Test of hypothesis

Table 4.3: Correlation Analysis and Test of Hypothesis on the relationship between supervisor incivility and employee commitment is not significant and positive.

Correlations

		supervisor incivility	employee commitment
supervisor incivility	Pearson Correlation	1	.966**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	283	283
employee commitment	Pearson Correlation	- .966**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	283	283

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: Field Survey, 2023

Table 4.3 shows the correlation analysis and test of hypothesis for supervisor incivility and employee commitment of brewing firms in Anambra State. The results revealed that there is a strong negative relationship existing between supervisor incivility and employee

commitment with a coefficient of -0.966. It is also revealed that the relationship is statistically significant with a p-value of 0.000 which is less than 0.05 (p-value < level of significance).

Discussion of Findings

Findings obtained from a test of the formulated hypothesis reveals that there exists a significant negative relationship between supervisor incivility and employee commitment. This corroborates the study of Ayşe and Asli (2015) who investigated the effect of workplace incivility on perf

ormance. Findings revealed a relationship between the studied variables. The study of Nwaeke and Akani (2019) who examined the effect of down top workplace incivility on employee performance of deposit money banks in Rivers State is also in tandem with findings obtained from a test of the hypothesis. The study found that there is a negative significant relationship between the studied variables. The work of Mehmood, Ramzan and Yasmeen (2021) who investigated workplace incivility and organizational commitment of women colleges in Punjab Pakistan is also in line with findings obtained from a test of the hypothesis. Findings revealed a strong negative relationship between workplace incivility and employee performance.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The following was observed from the test of hypothesis carried out: There is a significant negative relationship between supervisor incivility and employee commitment in brewery firms in Anambra State with the Correlation Coefficient of -0.966 and P-value of 0.000 < .05.

Conclusion

From the findings of this study, it was concluded that workplace incivility has a negative relationship with employee performance of brewing firms in Anambra State. This is owing to the fact that supervisor incivility was seen to have a significant negative relationship with employee commitment in brewery firms in Anambra State.

Recommendation

As a follow up to the findings obtained from a test of the formulated hypothesis, the researcher recommended that supervisors of the studied brewing firms should avoid all forms of uncivil behaviours as it could impact the commitment level of employees.

REFERENCES

Achara, L., Onyemaechi, U., & Eberechi, R.U. (2020). Workplace incivility and employee retention in the hospitality industries in Nigeria. *Economics and Social Sciences Academic Journal*, 2(5), 1-11.

Adeyeye T.C (2014). The effect of workplace deviance behaviour on employee performance. *Elixir Marketing Mgmt. 68 (2014) 22559-22563.*

Alexandra, L.G. (2013). *Organizational Learning and Performance: Conceptual Model. Proceedings of the 7th International Management Conference on "New Management for the new Economy." Bucharest, Romania.*

Alias, M., Rasdi, R.M., Ismail, M., & Samah, B.A. (2013). Predictors of workplace deviant behavior: HRD agenda for Malaysian support personnel. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 37(2), 161-182.

Alola U.V, Asongu S.A and Alola A.A (2021) Linking supervisor incivility with job embeddedness and cynicism: The mediating role of employee self-efficacy. Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business.

Andersson, L.M., & Pearson, C.M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. Academy of Management Review, 24(3), 452–471.

Aryee, S. Chen, Z.X. & Sun, L.Y. (2007). Antecedents and Outcomes of Abusive Supervision: test of a Trickle-down Model. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92(1): 8-19.

Bruursema, K. (2004). Leadership style and the link with counterproductive work behavior (CWB): An investigation using the job-stress/CWB model *(*Doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida).

Bunk, J.A., and Magley, V J. (2013). The role of appraisals and emotions in understanding experiences of workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *18*(1), 87-105. Chang-e L, Wei Xie Y and Chen J.H(2018). Supervisor Incivility and Employee Silence: Does Chinese Traditionality Matter? *International Journal of Business and Social Science Vol. 9, No. 6 June, doi:10.30845/ijbss.v9n6p7.*

Chen, Y., Ferris, D.L., Kwan, H.K., Yan, M., Zhou, M., and Hong, Y. 2013. Self-love's lost labor: A self-enhancement model of workplace incivility. *Academy of Management Journal*, *56*(4), 1199-1219.

Cingöz, A. & Kaplan, A. (2015). An examination of the mediating role of job satisfaction on the relationship between psychological empowerment and innovative behavior, international review of social sciences, 3(2), 60-72.

Cortina, L.M., Magley, V.J., Williams, J.H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. Journal of Occupational Healt Psychology, 6(1), 64–80.

Cortina, L.M.; Magley, V.J. Patterns and profiles of response to incivility in the Workplace. J. Occup. Health Psychol. **2009**, 14, 272–288.

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Cooper, C. (Eds.). (2003). Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: *International perspectives in research and practice. CRC Press*.

Galford, R. & Seibold, D.A. (2006). *The trusted leader: Bringing out the best in your people and your company*. New York: The Free Press.

Giumetti, G.W., Mckibben, E.S., Hatfield, A.L., Schroeder, A.N., Et al. (2012). Cyber incivility@work: the new age of interpersonel deviance, cyberpsychology, behavior, and social networking, 15(3), 148-154.

Griffin, B. (2010). Multilevel relationships between organizational-level incivility, justice and intention to Stay. Work & stress,24(4),309-323.

Hoel, H., & Cooper, C.L. (2000). *Destructive conflict and bullying at work.* Manchester, UK: Manchester School of Management, University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology.

Irsan T, Hendryad S, Saida Z. ZA & Sukisno S.R | (2020) Workplace incivility, work engagement, and turnover intentions: Multi-group analysis, Cogent Psychology, 7:1, 1743627, DOI: 10.1080/23311908.2020.1743627.

James E. Bartlett, II, Michelle E. Bartlett, and Thomas G. Reio, Jr.(2008*).* Workplace Incivility: Worker and Organizational Antecedents and Outcomes.

Kaneshiro, P. (2008). Analyzing the organizational justice, trust and commitment relationship in a public organization: Submitted to north central university, university microfilms. *The Humanities and Social Sciences*, pp. 14-20.

Keashly L., & Jagatic, K. (2003). By any other name: American perspectives on workplace bullying. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel , D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper, (Eds.), *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives on research and practice*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Lim, S., & Lee, A. (2011). Work and nonwork outcomes of workplace incivility: Does family support help? Journal of Occupational Health Psychology 16(1), 95–111.

Lim, S., Cortina, L.M., & Magley, V.J. (2008). Personal and workgroup incivility: Impact on work and health outcomes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 93(1), 95–107.

Liu, C. E., Huang, J. and Xie, W. (2018). The Effect of Supervisor Incivility on Employee Creativity: A Chin-Mediation Model. Jiangsu Social Sciences, 39(3):165-174.

Mangione, J.W and Quinn, R.P (2005), "Job satisfaction, Counter-productive behaviour and use at work" Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol 60.

Manning, G. & Curtis, K. (2009). *The art of leadership, (3rd ed.)*, New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Mehmood, B. Ramzan, M., and Yasmeen, B. (2021*)*. Workplace Incivility and Organizational Commitment: The Case of Public Sector Women Colleges in Punjab, Pakistan. *Bulletin of Business and Economics*,10(4), 205-210.

Miebaka D.T and Ukwuije O.D (2021). Workplace Incivility and Counterproductive Work Behaviour: A Review of Literature. European Journal of Human Resource ISSN 2520-4697 (Online) Vol.5, Issue 1 pp 20 – 31.

Milam, A.C., Spitzmueller, C., & Penney, L.M. (2009). Investigating individual differences among targets of workplace incivility. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, *14*(1), 58.

Mount, M., Ilies, R., & Johnson, E. (2006). Relationship of personality traits and counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating effects of job satisfaction. *Personnel psychology*, 59(3), 591-622.

Muhammad Z, Arifa A. and Muhammad S.A (2017) The Impact of Workplace Incivility on Employee Absenteeism and Organization Commitment: *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences 2017, Vol. 7, No. 5 ISSN: 2222-6990*

Nigarish., Uswa., Islam, B., & Ali, S. (2019). Incivility? It's Effect On Performance In Organization. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 6*(7)* 393-398. Journal of Business and Management Review Vol.7, No.5, pp.61-84. Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK.

Pearson, C.M, Andersson, L.M., & Porath, C.L. (2005). Workplace incivility. **In** S. Fox, & P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors*

and targets (pp. 177-200). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.

Pearson, C., & Porath, C. (2009). The cost of bad behavior: How incivility ruins your business and what you can do about it. Portfolio.

Porath, C.L., & Pearson, C.M. (2000, August). *Gender differences and the behaviour of targets of workplace incivility: He "dukes" it out, she "disappears" herself.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Toronto,Ontario, Canada.

Porath, C.L., & Pearson, C.M. (2012). Emotional and behavioral responses to workplace incivility and the impact of hierarchical status. Journal of Applied Psychology, 42(1), 326–357.

Porath, C.L.; Erez, A (2009). Overlooked but not untouched: How rudeness reduces onlookers' performance on routine and creative tasks. Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process.109, 29–44.

Reio, T.G., Jr, & Sanders-Reio, J. (2011). Thinking about workplace engagement: Does supervisor and coworker incivility really matter? Advances in Developing Human Resources, 13(4), 462–478.

Reio, T.G., Jr., & Ghosh, R. (2009). Antecedents and outcomes of workplace incivility: Implications for human resource development research and practice. *Human Resource Development Quarterly.*

Riasat, F., & Nisar, Q.A. 2016. Does a workplace incivility influence employee's job stress and turnover intentions by moderating role of psychological capital: Descriptive study on banking sector Gujranwala; Pakistan. *International Journal of Scientific and Engineering Research, 7*(12), 17-30.

Richard, P.J., Devinney, T.M., Yip, G.S. & Johnson, G. (2009). Measuring organizational performance: Towards methodological best practice. *Journal of Management*, 35(3), 718-804.

Robbins, S.P. & Coulter, M. (2013). *Management, (11th ed.)*. England, UK: Pearson Education Limited.

Robinson, S.L., & Bennett, R.J. (2003). A typology of deviant workpalace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of management journal*, *38*(2), 555-55

Saleem, F.; Malik, M.I.; Asif,I.; Qasim,(2022) A.Workplace Incivility and Employee Performance: Does Trust in Supervisors Matter? (A Dual Theory Perspective). Behav. Sci., 12, 513.

Shi, k., Gao, L.P., Huang, X., & Sha, J.Y. (2012). The impact of leadership behavior on employee silence: an analysis of the mediating role of trust. Management Review, 24(10):94-101.

Sidle, S.D. (2009). Workplace incivility: how should employees and managers respond?, academy of management perspectives, 23(4), 88-89.

Sliter, M., Sliter, K., & Jex, S. (2012). The employee as a punching bag: The effect of multiple sources of incivility on employee withdrawal behaviour and sales performance. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33(1), 121–139.

Spector, P.E., & Fox, S. (2005). A stressor-emotion model of counterproductive work behaviour. In S. Fox & P.E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behavior: investigations o.lactors and targets* (pp. 151-174). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Speedy, S. (2006). Workplace violence: the dark side of organisational life, contemporary nurse, 21(2), 239-250.

Taylor, S.G., and Kluemper, D.H. 2012. Linking perceptions of role stress and incivility to workplace aggression: the moderating role of personality. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, *17*(3), 316.

Trudel J. (2009) "Workplace incivility : relationship with conflict management styles and impaction perceived job performance, organizational commitment and turnover." (2009). Electronic Theses and Dissertations. Paper 1460.

Wegge, J.,Van-Dick, R., Fisher, G.K., West, M.A. & Dawson, J.F. (2006). "A test of basic assumptions of affective events theory (AET) in call centre work". *British Journal of Management*, 17 (3), 237-254.

Zhang H, Kwan, H.K, Zhang, X and Wu L.Z, (2014) High core self-evaluators maintain creativity: a motivational model of abusive supervision. Journal of Management 40(4), 1151–1174.